

IV

The Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 70.14, this exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the licensee an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 for Quad Cities.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact (63 FR 10957).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-8918 Filed 4-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-220]

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is permitting the withdrawal of Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation's (the licensee) application of September 20, 1996, regarding the proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in Oswego County, New York.

The proposed amendment would have revised the facility technical specifications by changing certain surveillance requirements currently performed during refueling outages such that the surveillance requirements could be performed when the reactor is operating or during outage periods not associated with refueling. The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on December 18, 1996 (61 FR 66709). However, by letter dated March 12, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated September 20, 1996, and the licensee's letter dated March 12, 1998, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above

documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Darl S. Hood,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-8917 Filed 4-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311]

Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee) to withdraw its May 14, 1997, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75 for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would have revised the facility technical specifications pertaining to the surveillance requirements for the control room air conditioning system by changing the filter testing boundary and associated acceptance criteria.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1997 (62 FR 29158). However, by letter dated March 12, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 14, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated March 12, 1998, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Patrick D. Milano,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-8919 Filed 4-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-607]

Department of the Air Force at McClellan Air Force Base (McClellan Air Force Base Triga Reactor); Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of Facility Operating License No. R-130 for a term of 20 years for the Department of the Air Force at McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) (the applicant) 2.3-megawatt thermal (MW(t)) TRIGA reactor located at the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center (MNRC), McClellan AFB, California.

Description of Proposed Action

The proposed action is the issuance of Facility Operating License No. R-130 for the MNRC TRIGA research reactor at McClellan AFB, California, in response to an application from the applicant dated October 23, 1996, as supplemented. The proposed action would authorize operation of the MNRC reactor at a power level of 2.3 MW(t) for a period of 20 years. The reactor has pulsing capability, with a maximum reactivity step addition of 1.75\$ proposed by the applicant. The MNRC has been in operation since mid-1991 under the authority of the Department of the Air Force under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy Act. The applicant has sought NRC licensing of the reactor due to the planned closure of McClellan AFB.

Summary of the Environmental Assessment

The NRC staff has reviewed the applicant's application for an operating license including the applicant's environmental report. To document its review, the staff has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) which examined radiological and nonradiological impacts of continued operation, the environmental effects of postulated radiological accidents, and the long-term effects of continued facility operation. Based on its review of the applicant's application, the staff has determined that the environmental